

Envisioning Critical Social Entrepreneurship Education: Possibilities, Questions, and Guiding Commitments

Mark Joseph Congdon Jr.
Sacred Heart University

Liliana Herakova
University of Maine

Abstract

Higher education institutions continue to be increasingly interested in examining how social entrepreneurship and community engaged approaches to education can work together. In light of the recent growth and interest in such programs, scholars and educators have called for attention to specific considerations when developing SE and community-based education, which can be summed up in three areas - pedagogy, relationships, and impact. The present essay builds on such propositions, and calls for a critically-orientated approach to SE, grounded in community engagement, collaborative dialogue among diverse voices, and a commitment to transforming oppressive structures

Keywords: social entrepreneurship; community engagement; community-based research; community partnerships; critical pedagogy; service-learning

Social entrepreneurship (SE) is a popular, yet complicated idea being taught in programs at colleges across the country. We find that these programs often lack attention to or interest in ethics, relationships, and social (in)justice impacts. To illustrate, the following selected quotes, in dialogue with one another, reflect the direction and emphases offered in a social entrepreneurship experience at a northeastern research university.

Student 1: *Do something that you love and take these [SE] principles and apply it to whatever that is, whether it's starting your own business, that's great. If it's helping somebody else succeed in business, that's excellent. If it's changing the world through some kind of nonprofit organization, then that's it.*

Program Manager/Instructor 1: *The reason we have some assignments the way that they are -- associated with some kind of economic value, is because products are just easiest for students to work on. So, if they understand products because it's a tangible thing, then they really start to understand the mindset and they can much more easily adapt it to the more complex ideas that they're going to be coming up with.*

Student 2: *It depends on what kind of social change you're going for. If you're going for moral social change, I don't think [SE] helps in that situation. Because it is focused on the economics and doesn't make it about morals, it makes it about money...more like "How can we get people to spend money on this?", then it's not about social change at all.*

Program Manager/Instructor 2: *We now talk about it (SE) in terms of concept value and that value doesn't just mean economic value...the assignments that we've had the focus has been on economic value, but it's really about measuring impact. And that might be an economic impact if it's a product, but if it's a social change idea that impact is something completely different.*

Student 3: *Change is complicated and there isn't always an easy fix or solution like [SE]'s system makes you think, but being passionate and feeling compelled to make a change can help drive you forward.*

These quotes are excerpted from interviews conducted with instructors, administrators, and students enrolled in a SE education program¹. Although the voices above highlight various contentious stances, they also seem to share a focus on “you,” the social entrepreneur, who determines the passions that serve as drivers of innovation, the morals and the benefits (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2010, 2012; Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010). It is worthwhile noting that even the more critical voices in the program embodied ideologies of individual, strongly-felt motivations for innovation, rather than ones of informed structural critique and transformation, where (individual) affect is certainly a key, but not the only, piece. In response, this essay builds on the first author’s dissertation² (Congdon Jr., 2018) and calls for a critically-orientated approach to SE education, grounded in community engagement, collaborative dialogue among diverse voices, and a commitment to transforming oppressive structures (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2010, 2012; Roper & Cheney, 2005; Verduijn et al., 2014). We recognize that there are many calls for and moves toward critical SE practice that come from within various business and social initiatives (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2010, 2012, 2016; Verduijn et al., 2014). Intersecting these with the principles of engaged critical pedagogies, we propose a framework for Critical Social Entrepreneurship Education (CSEE) in academic contexts.

Overview of SE and Community-Based Education: Defining Key Terms

K-12 and higher education institutions continue to be increasingly interested in SE programs, which have emerged as inventive responses to complex social issues by combining strategic business methods with engaged efforts to address community needs (Amundam, 2019; Brock & Steiner, 2009; Dees, 2007, 2012; Enos, 2015; Holland, George, & Nelson, 2019; Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010; Winfield, 2005). Principles of SE practice inform SE education (Ney et al., 2014; Roper & Cheney, 2005; Saebi, Foss, & Linder, 2019; Short, Moss, & Lumpkin, 2009), where students try to apply the skills they learn to bring about *innovations* -- perspectives, talents, and resources -- in order to tackle social problems (Cho, 2006; Enos, 2015; Jarrodi & Bureau, 2019; Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010; Kickul & Lyons, 2012; Roper & Cheney, 2005). Despite these seemingly shared principles, numerous terms are frequently used interchangeably in the literature to speak of SE education. According to Enos (2015), for example, 51% of universities in the United States and around the world use the terms innovation, social innovation, or social entrepreneurship to describe the work of their specific SE programs.

Innovation, Social Entrepreneurship (SE), and Education

Within SE, the concept of innovation traces its lineage to business practices of cultivating a mindset and a skillset to creatively capitalize on the opportunities offered by dynamic contexts (think “Shark Tank”). On the other hand, however, within SE, innovation is tinted with a philosophy of effecting positive social change. Here, it attaches to the “social” aspect of SE and is known as social innovation (SI). SI is conceptualized as a “collective creation of new legitimated social practices aiming at social change” (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014, p. 49). SIs encompass both material and non-material dimensions. The actual innovation, its

¹The first author of this paper was enrolled as a graduate student in the program that he researched. As a critical educator, his experience as a SE student was unsettling, prompting the idea for this conceptual paper and for an in-depth case study research into the specific SE educational program. Some of the specific igniting points of reflection included asking questions about complexities of white social entrepreneurs working *with* Native American communities and not *for*. Such inquiries were met with blanket encouragements to “trust the SE system and process,” motivating the authors to explore what other - more critical and engaged - possibilities for response are there.

² The second author is a critical communication pedagogy scholar and educator, who became familiar with the SE educational program discussed here in their role as a co-advisor for the dissertation project.

mechanism, and product are the material dimensions of SIs, while changes in attitudes, behaviors, perceptions, or even structures that result in new social practices are the non-material dimensions of SIs (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; Osburg & Schmidpeter, 2013). Kickul and Lyons (2012) offered the following as a shared vision for social innovation:

[A] social innovator [i.e. student] adds value to people's lives by pursuing a social mission, using the processes, tools, and techniques of business entrepreneurship. She or he puts societal benefit ahead of personal gain by using the "profits" generated by her or his enterprise to expand the reach of her or his mission. The social entrepreneur's vehicle for pursuing her or his mission could be for-profit, nonprofit, or public in its structure, or it could be hybrid, or any of these. (p. 19)

Even with such a vision foregrounded in some SE educational programs, questions remain as to if and how it is embodied in learning practices and community relationships (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2010, 2012, 2016; Jarrodi & Bureau, 2019; Verduijn et al., 2014). Scholars and researchers have sought to develop models that accomplish the mission articulated by Kickul and Lyons (2012). For example, Dees and Anderson (2006) call for SE educational programs to combine two schools of thought: a) "The Social Enterprise School," which is "focused on the generation of 'earned income' to serve a social mission" (p. 41); and b) "The Social Innovation School," which focuses on "establishing new and better ways to address social problems or meet social needs" (p. 50). In other words, they emphasize that business philosophies and elements (such as aiming at a profitable solution) should be interwoven with a commitment to change that benefits the greater good. Short, Moss, and Lumpkin (2009) argue that such interweaving necessitates an interdisciplinary approach to conceptualizing, learning, practicing, and researching SE.

However, other SE scholars continue to express concern with how SE is conceptualized and practiced within these two schools, as they tend to privilege a neoliberal ideology and do not always address the tensions inherent in the SE literature (Cho, 2006; Jarrodi, Byrne, & Bureau, 2019). For instance, Dey and Steyaert (2012) explain how the conceptualization and practice of SE tends to be "conceived of solely as an economically viable, yet largely depoliticised, blueprint for dealing with societal problems" (p. 91). This is also reflected in the quotes shared at the beginning of this essay. Relatedly, Jarrodi, Byrne, and Bureau (2019) found that social "entrepreneur's political ideology is tangled in their practices" (p. 598), and because of this, the SE process and research needs to better understand and account for how political ideologies shape the motivations of social entrepreneurs in specific sites, spaces, and contexts. Additionally, Verduijn, Dey, Tedmanson, and Essers (2014) assert the necessity for SE education to include a critical perspective in order to question "taken for granted assumptions underpinning (social) entrepreneurship studies" (p. 99), and as a result, (re)imagine and (re)contextualize SE processes and practices.

To account for these various schools of thought and perspectives of SE, in this essay we use Jensen's (2014) "holistic person perspective" to a SE education, which connects the entrepreneur's (i.e., student's) "knowledge, identity and network in a broad time and space approach" (p. 355) to the SE program's learning outcomes and activities. From this framework, SE is defined as "the development and implementation of a [realistic] social initiative with the primary purpose to create social value in a given context" (Jensen, 2014, p. 358).

Community-Engaged Education and Social Entrepreneurship (SE)

Similarly to SE, there are various definitions of and approaches to community engagement, with (critical) service-learning frequently considered a specific praxis within the broader field (Ahmed et. al, 2016; Belone et. al, 2016; Britt, 2014; Davis, Madden, Cronley, Beamon, 2019; Dutta, 2017; Hammersley, 2012; Ivankova, 2017; Janes, 2016; Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010; Mitchell, 2008; Reason, & Bradbury, 2001; Stoecker, 2009). The diverse approaches to community engagement and (critical) service-learning are connected by an

emphasis on working *with* community partners for (local) change, decentering the university/faculty/educator's voice, and embracing dialogue and critical reflexivity. Here, we frame community-engagement/service-learning through a community-based participatory (CBP) education approach, which brings together *action* and *reflection* in the collaborative pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people and their communities (Belone et. al, 2016; Britt, 2014; Hammersley, 2012; Ivankova, 2017; Janes, 2016; Mitchell, 2008; Reason, & Bradbury, 2001; Stoecker, 2009).

Studies have examined similarities and differences between community-based education and SE education, as well as how these two approaches could work together, such as through (critical) service-learning, collaborative pedagogies, and/or community-centered entrepreneurial initiatives (Enos, 2015; Herzig, Kelman, Krikun, Matthews, & Browning, 2018; Holland, George, & Nelson, 2019; Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010; Oloke, Lindsay, & Byrne, 2018; Vidra, Gallagher & Wilson, 2019). Drawing on interdisciplinary knowledge, including from within the business field, specific considerations have emerged for a more critical, community-based development of SE education (Amundam, 2019; Dees, 2007, 2012; Dey & Steyaert, 2012; 2016; Enos, 2015; Janus, 2015; Jensen, 2014; Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010; Oloke, Lindsay, & Byrne, 2018; Verduijn et al., 2014; Winfield, 2005; Zietsma & Tuck, 2012). These considerations can be summed up in three areas -- pedagogy, relationships, and impact -- which correspond to the following questions: a) What pedagogical praxis should underlie SE education in/among various cultural, educational, and community contexts?; b) How do students, educators, scholars, and community partners develop meaningful relationships and work together in SE education programs?; and c) What (educational and social) impact results from the partnerships developed in/through the SE education program? These questions are important to consider when conceptualizing a critically-oriented community-based approach to SE education that recognizes and further develops the roots and growth of entrepreneurship education with the business field.

The framework we propose builds on Dees and Anderson's (2006) and Short, Moss, and Lumpkin's (2009) arguments that SE education should take a collaborative approach that cuts across business and other disciplines to address social problems. We also advance Dey's and Steyaert's (2010; 2012) model of critiquing SE with an "interventionist edge," building on the very principles of innovation that are foundational to SE. The goal of this essay, then, is to explore the creative tensions and the possibilities that exist for a community-based SE educational program that aims to foster both business success and positive social change. This essay builds on such propositions, adding an explicitly critical orientation to SE (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2010; 2012; 2016; Verduijn et al., 2014), which is generally missing from SE education and is not necessarily present in all dimensions of the service-learning/community engagement continuum (Britt, 2014; Furco, 1996; Furco & Norvell, 2019; Guthman, 2008; Mitchell, 2008; Stoecker, 2009).

We offer a starting point for a conversation on what a critical community-engaged SE education approach might entail as it attends to how innovation, power, privilege, and service are conceptualized and practiced. Specifically, we envision a *critical social entrepreneurship education* (CSEE) framework, which adds commitments and practices of critical pedagogy and community-engagement to SE education. CSEE responds to the three key considerations for developing SE educational programs -- pedagogy, relationships, and impact -- by centering community with the goal of using dialogic-collaborative processes to determine appropriate innovations and their implementation, which may or may not seek profit generation (Congdon Jr., 2018; Oloke, Lindsay, & Byrne, 2018).

To further articulate a CSEE framework, in the next sections we first briefly overview the theoretical foundations of community-engaged and SE educational approaches, drawing relevant parallels between the two. We then take up, in turn, each of the three concerns --

pedagogy, relationships, impact -- that have been identified as key to developing SE education programs. Specifically, we map out a direction for SE education development, guided by critical community-engaged orientation to each of those three concerns.

Critical Foundations of Community-Engaged Education

Critical pedagogies (CP) and theories are concerned with understanding and transforming culture and oppressive ideological and structural processes (Fassett & Warren, 2007; Freire, 1970/2000; Frey & Palmer, 2014; 2017; Giroux, 2012; hooks, 1994; 2003). From a critical perspective, education is a site of both control and transformation, as it is embedded with(in) powerful ideologies and hierarchical social systems. CP identifies a dominant narrative in which educational limitations and achievements are seen as individual failures and accomplishments, furthering an ideology of meritocracy (Bartolome, 2004). This critique is especially salient to educational models, such as SE, which originated in the capitalist business practices of the global North, and are, thus aligned with valuing innovation as individual success, measured in financial gains (Cho, 2006; Jarroldia, Byrneb, & Bureauc, 2019; Lipman, 2017; Zietsma & Tuck, 2012).

In response to CP concerns and supporting aims to privilege social justice as an overarching goal of education (Freire, 1970/2000), scholar-educators have identified classroom strategies and instructional techniques that promote critical praxis (e.g., Nylund & Tilsen, 2006). Some have described critical instructional approaches (Breunig, 2009), while others have offered guidelines (implicit or explicit) for teaching courses with social justice goals (e.g., DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2014). Practically, such literature suggested the advantages of co-constructed learning goals, collaborative work, journal writing, student dialogue, and the use of multiple forms of evaluation. Such strategies are theorized to provide opportunities for critical reflection and link political issues with personal experiences (Lewison, Flint, & Van Sluys, 2002) while also potentially redefining the role of the teacher (Breunig, 2005; Suoranta & Moiso, 2006).

The usefulness of such strategies in effecting CP learning goals and outcomes, however, remains uncertain. For instance, such approaches do not distinguish themselves as critical alternatives to generic student-centered pedagogies (Breunig, 2011). Breunig (2005) noted that strategies associated with critical pedagogies (e.g., reflection, experiential activities, presentations, group work) can be implemented devoid of social justice goals, reducing critical pedagogies to “tokenism” (p. 120). Critics suggested that critical pedagogies may not only fail to disrupt hegemonic educational practices, but may, in fact, reproduce the very “relations of domination” they intend to challenge (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 298). Other scholars have echoed this critique (e.g., Gore, 1993; Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005) and have expanded Ellsworth’s discussion of the contradictions inherent in the practice of critical pedagogies (Evans, 2010; Gur-Ze’ev, 1998; Shor, 1996).

In their articulation of Critical Communication Pedagogy (CCP), Fassett and Warren (2007) perform such critiques in highlighting that the “critical” aspect of pedagogy is not so much in the “what you do” of teaching, as it is in the foundational commitments of educational praxis. In resisting and transforming structures of subordination inherent in neoliberal education, CP should move students and teachers to examine power and privilege as they operate in our mundane lives, particularly with regards to culture and its ideological structures, such as language (Cummins, 2014; Fassett & Warren, 2007). Such critical reflexivity opens possibilities of imagining and enacting a more socially just world (Fassett & Warren, 2007). However, Kahl Jr. (2017) discussed how CCP is criticized for not having an applied focus to pragmatically solve real problems in our world.

Straddling the tensions between applications and critical reflection, between action and analysis, community-based education developed as a particular form of critical pedagogy, which emphasizes campus-community engagement, where students work in and with local

communities for positive change, extending learning beyond the classroom walls (Britt, 2014; Enos, 2015; Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010). The diverse applied approaches to community-based education share a commitment to enhancing relational and multidimensional learning by discovering ways in which activism could serve community interests and participation in public life (Britt, 2014; Jovanovic, Congdon Jr., Miller, & Richardson, 2015; Kajner, Chovanec, Underwood, & Mian, 2013; McInerney, Smyth, & Down, 2011; Stenhouse & Jarrett, 2012). Partnerships between universities and communities encourage students to critically examine the world(s) we live in and the processes which govern them (Britt, 2014). Danowitz and Tuitt (2011) explain that higher education needs to embrace the idea that learning should be used for social and political change by challenging students to use the knowledge they acquire to promote equity and social justice. This examination gives rise to a critical consciousness and the opportunity to challenge the status quo (Freire 1970/2000). Here, community-based education as critical pedagogy is used to build social justice communities through awareness and intervention (Frey & Palmer, 2014; 2017; Jovanovic, Congdon Jr., Miller, & Richardson, 2015).

In contrast to the traditional entrepreneurial values of individual success, community-based education is concerned with pluralism, the common good, understanding human difference, and acting together for a more socially just world (Britt, 2014; Frey & Palmer, 2014; 2017; Jovanovic, Congdon Jr., Miller, & Richardson, 2015; Kajner, Chovanec, Underwood, & Mian, 2013; Stenhouse & Jarrett, 2012). It opens “opportunities to discuss and debate how particular decisions affect all community members” (Oyler, 2012, p. 7), and then determine what steps to take, in solidarity (Frey & Palmer, 2014). Mahoney (2011) pointed out that community-based learning may be seen as in-tension with traditional Western educational philosophies: “it is one thing to prepare an individual to enter a public sphere and argue for her or his position; it is quite another to prepare individuals to enter into relationships of solidarity and interdependence, and reconstruct their identities and practices” (p.152). We prefer to see this tension as a continuum, and it is on this continuum where we (re)imagine SE education from a critical community-engaged lens.

Critical Developments in Social Entrepreneurship (SE) Education

As mentioned previously, SE education is growing globally, motivated by the assertion that it offers the “only true sustainable mode of humanitarianism in place today” to solve our world’s most pressing problems through socially-minded innovation (Brock, Steiner, & Jordan, 2012, p. 90). From a SE education perspective, the more critically oriented approaches to education, such as CP/CCP and community engaged practices, fail to deliver on their promises of social justice, as they tend to lack innovative and sustainable approaches and do not focus on actual, assessable outcomes. Rather, non-SE education approaches tend to mirror existing methods to social change (Enos, 2015). As an alternative to other educational approaches, many SE education scholars and educators believe that meaningful change can only occur if we “displace current models of higher education with offerings that are more flexible, entail lower costs, and afford access to more students” (Enos, 2015, pp. 14-15). As Thorp and Goldstein (2010) explained, social entrepreneurs begin the SE “process of defining success from the opposite direction, gravitating toward innovation, not emulation, as a way to achieve institutional excellence and sustainable competitive advantage” (p. 135). SE education positions itself as this “disruptive innovation” (Enos, 2015, p. 14), emphasizing the importance of quantifiable goals and metrics and using strategic business and communication methods to achieve these goals.

Scholars have found that SE programs help students develop an entrepreneurial mindset, where they embrace market-orientated approaches and competences and perform themselves as the “experts” addressing social problems (Brock & Steiner, 2009; Congdon Jr., 2018; Dees, 2007; Enos, 2015; Jensen, 2014; Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010; Winfield, 2005).

Alongside teaching students how to think and act as social entrepreneurs (Jensen, 2014), SE programs are promoted for developing cooperation, agreeableness, openness, and conscientiousness (Kickul, Janssen-Selvadurai, & Griffiths, 2012; Nga & Shamuganathan, 2010). Pache and Chowdhury (2012) explain that SE programs should work to develop students' abilities to "bridge competing social-welfare, commercial and public-sector logics" (p. 494). To develop these skills, programs relay on various experiential learning techniques, including blended and/or hybrid learning (Congdon Jr., 2018; Wyke, 2013), project-based or team learning (Brock & Steiner, 2009; Janus, 2015; Jensen, 2014; Wyke, 2013), and even service-learning (Abbott & Lear, 2010; Enos, 2015; Gilmartin, 2013; Litzky, Godshalk, & Walton-Bongers, 2010).

SE education programs have evolved over time, and SE scholars and educators continue to examine avenues for further development. Such developments and their importance were also referenced in the opening quotes, when one of the instructors discusses moving away from economic value and towards concept value. There are also growing critical branches of SE. Specifically, Dees (2012) and Zietsma and Tuck (2012) called for an SE education to work *with* a community and not *for* a community. Pache and Chowdhury (2012) advocated for SE education programs to teach students what SE looks like in various community contexts for social good (i.e. social-welfare, commercial, and public-sector), while also not forcing students to accept an SE identity. Specifically, Pache and Chowdhury (2012) emphasized the need to embed identity work beyond the course content and experiential learning. They acknowledged that some students may struggle with accepting the tenets of SE education and bridging these concepts into the various sectors/fields of interest due to their previous educational and social experiences, reactions of other students and their families, and doubts about potential "low-class" professional opportunities with lower salaries due to doing more social justice/public service type of work (p. 505). Recognizing the possible limitations of traditional SE education, as described previously in the two schools of thought, Martinez, Padmanabhan, and Toyne (2007) described how they (re)developed their business-related courses/curriculum to incorporate social justice frameworks. The goal was to focus on developing students' citizenship needed for active community life, as well as for rewarding business careers related to (social) entrepreneurship. Martinez, Padmanabhan, and Toyne (2007) did this through a variety of experiential activities and methods, including developing community partnerships, acknowledging limitations of the business methods/practices, incorporating cultural context and ethics from a globalized (post-colonized) framework, and including an apprenticeship type approach where students had the opportunity to study abroad. Echoing such critical SE praxis, Jensen's (2014) "holistic person perspective" (p. 250) to an SE education (which informs this essay) incorporates situated learning and culturally relevant teaching (Bassey, 2016; Gay, 2010; Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Some SE education courses have attempted to integrate critical community-based learning (Abbott & Lear, 2010; Gilmartin, 2013; Litzky, Godshalk, & Walton-Bongers, 2010), and serve as exemplars. For instance, Litzky, Godshalk, and Walton-Bongers (2010) described a service-learning course in SE and community leadership, in which graduate student mentors were paired with high school student protégés within teams. Gilmartin (2013) developed a SE service-learning nursing course with the goal of enhancing students' "understanding of the sources of inequality in the United States and providing the requisite skills to promote effective nursing action for social change" (p. 641). Abbott and Lear's (2010) SE Spanish course partnered students with a local nonprofit and found that "all stakeholders in a CSL course can benefit when students move beyond class requirements to self-directed social action" (Abbott & Lear, 2010, p. 243). These three applied studies highlight how a community-based approach, like service-learning, can be incorporated into an SE education to the benefit of both students and community partners. More importantly, they highlight how a critical community-based

approach to SE education can be incorporated in disciplines outside of business, where students and community partners work together to solve a local problem beyond economic development. However, despite such attempts and calls by some SE scholars and educators to change toward a community-centered approach (Dees, 2012; Enos, 2015; Janus, 2015; Winfield, 2005; Zietsma & Tuck, 2012), the individualized approach with the entrepreneur as the expert “hero” of the innovation, continues to be privileged (Dey & Steyaert, 2010, 2012; Enos, 2015; Jones, Warner, Kiser, 2010; Short, Moss, & Lumpkin, 2009; Zietsma & Tuck, 2012).

Other critiques of SE education point out that its impacts are mixed, as programs struggle to articulate how they account for the effects they have on the social problems they seek to address (Enos, 2015; Jensen, 2014; Ney et al., 2014; Short, Moss, & Lumpkin, 2009; Verduijn, et al., 2014). As Jones, Warner, and Kiser (2010) alluded to, the positive “social” change aspect is sometimes lost in the SE process, since the focus is on profit, which in turn may reinforce oppressive ideologies, structures, and systems that the SE initiative is attempting to change. Therefore, recognizing and working to address this limitation within SE education is important, especially if social change is really the end goal and focus of a SE education. In response, the CSEE framework attempts to center the SE process, while closely and continuously focusing on communities’ roles and voices.

The histories of developing CP/CCP and SE as two different approaches to experiential and engaged learning reveal a struggle between critically examining and striving to transform unequal capitalist/neoliberal structures, on the one hand, and serving these same structures through (often limited and skills-focused) involvement with communities and organizations. A CSEE framework may allow us to examine and potentially “harness” the transformative potential of such tensions (Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Martin & Nakayama, 1999; Mumby, 2005; Verduijn et al., 2014).

Shifting Paradigms: Bringing Critical Community-based Praxis to Social Entrepreneurship Education

In what follows, we propose and elaborate on three guiding commitments of the CSEE framework, which we believe may hold, “the potential to democratize and decolonize knowledge production by engaging communities and citizens” (Janes, 2016, p. 72) in creating and developing innovative and sustainable solutions to social issues of concern. These three commitments are neither comprehensive, nor exhaustive, but serve as a starting point for envisioning a critically-oriented community-based approach to SE.

Commitment 1: A CSEE pedagogy fosters analytical reflexivity with the goal of continuously acknowledging and examining cultural contexts and power within and throughout the entrepreneurial, learning, and community-based praxis.

Commitment 2: A CSEE framework embraces a relational model of solidarity, committed to working *with* (rather than *for*) communities, partners, and others on (potential) solutions to social change issues.

Commitment 3: From a CSEE lens, impact is conceptualized as (smaller scale) social change efforts that are sustainable and purposefully attentive to local contexts, and may or may not be focused on economics or for-profit solutions.

Although the section below takes up each of these commitments separately, pedagogy, relationships, and impact are interrelated and mutually constitutive. For example, in his analysis of SE, Dees (2007, 2012) argued that long-term social change (impact dimension) is unlikely since the social entrepreneur (i.e., the student) seeks to solve a problem *for* and not *with* or guided by the community (relationship dimension), and thus never truly understands and/or solves the social issue that initiated the SE intervention (pedagogy dimension).

Pedagogy

Community-engaged and SE education share a focus on experience as key to learning, which suggests a pedagogical opening for integrating the two approaches. This shared understanding, however, does not necessarily lead to community-based CSEE. Experiential learning does not always ask students and instructors to critically examine and, “consider the aim, intent, and purpose of their practice(s)” (Breunig, 2005, p. 107). Lipman (2017) elaborated on this further by explaining how these educational strategies reinforce technical rationality and efficiency as educational processes are, “standardized, centrally prescribed and scripted, and subject to accounting measures” (p. 580). The section below briefly summarizes the experiential learning strategies of the SE program Congdon Jr. (2018) studied and identifies openings for integrating critical pedagogies in this model.

Consistent with the literature (e.g., Enos, 2014; Hall, 2013; Jensen, 2014; Kelly, 2014; Wyke, 2013), Congdon Jr. (2018) found that the SE program he studied embraced experiential pedagogies with emphasis on teaching how to efficiently estimate and measure impact, so that no time and money is wasted on “unsuccessful” ideas. A SE student in the study explained that, “before you go and implement your idea you need to fail fast and fail cheap so you don’t waste money...we are afraid to fail so we avoid the death threats, and by the time we tackle that death threat we are so deep in that we spent a lot of time and money wasted” (Congdon Jr., 2018, p. 215). The program’s philosophy was one of efficiency and individual responsibility to the success of the project -- of working and cycling through ideas and implementations quickly and with the least possible material loss. This philosophy undergirded the program’s emphasis on preparing students for their future careers with attention to setting and accomplishing practical goals (e.g., creating a business fundraising plan). A review of the curriculum and program documents suggested the program advocated for hands-on, market-oriented activities as benefiting students in both their academic learning and in their career paths (Congdon Jr., 2018).

In terms of pedagogy, however, there was also a tension between valuing student-centeredness and espousing standardized education delivery in order to minimize time spent in the classroom (Congdon Jr. 2018). Though it could reach more students faster and, supposedly, prepare them for their experiential learning, privileging dissemination through standardized education left little room for encouraging students to critically examine/apply what they learn to “work smarter and take action on your ideas” (Congdon Jr., 2018, p. 101). Further, the focus on efficiency and individual responsibility disregarded practices of critical reflexivity and collaboration, which are foundational to critical engaged pedagogies (Fassett & Warren, 2007; Frey & Palmer, 2014, 2017). In short, the program did not answer critical calls for SE education to ask tough questions and consider how it may have unintended consequences in communities and with students (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Verduijn et al., 2014; Zietsma & Tuck, 2012). Congdon Jr. (2018) also found resistance in the program to identify its own limitations, assumptions, and areas for growth. Such lack of reflexivity produced stagnation and exposed the SE program’s neoliberal ethics (Congdon Jr., 2018; Dey & Steyaert, 2012, 2016; Verduijn et al., 2014).

Despite such limitations, the SE program also articulated promising openings, specifically the opportunity to teach students a set of entrepreneurial skills, improving their confidence in their ability to apply knowledge in meaningful, community-oriented ways (Enos, 2015; Jensen, 2014; Wyke, 2013). How then, could SE education be (re)articulated and (re)imagined in a way that extends the entrepreneurial skills-based training towards an ethic of hope, community, and justice?

Critical communication pedagogy (CCP) guides a relationship-centered methodology for knowledge-production and intervention, known as Community Based Participatory Action Research (CBPAR), which is further discussed in the next section. Within Communication

Studies, this is embodied in Communication Activism Pedagogy (CAP; Frey & Palmer, 2014, 2017). Academic examples highlight that when CAP underlies service-learning, the projects are both reciprocal and focused on addressing deep ideological oppressive structures through facilitating ongoing processes. For instance, Enck (2014) discussed how students worked with a local domestic violence center to raise community awareness surrounding gender and violence. Jovanovic, Congdon Jr., Miller, and Richardson (2015) posited that interweaving CBPAR with CCP may allow for powerful spontaneous moments to arise in class, where students learn how to collaboratively respond-in-time to community partners' needs that were not anticipated. Relevant also to SE's embrace of failure as a growth opportunity, Gutierrez-Perez (2016) "advocate[d] for failure as a process of social justice" (p. 10).

Willink and Suzette (2012) discussed the challenges of implementing community-based research courses that seek to respond to local social justice struggles. Despite difficulties, they asserted that developing courses that are guided jointly by CBPAR and CCP allows for a "deeper and embodied experience of cultural dialogue and border crossing that abides and appreciates differences; allowing teachers, students, and communities to restructure pedagogical relationships through communication to reconstitute ways of knowing from a communal perspective" (Willink & Suzette, 2012, p. 209). This process is embodied in CAP, where students first become aware of and analyze social injustices and then learn how to "use their communication knowledge and skills to [collaboratively] intervene to attempt to reduce oppression and to achieve justice" (Simpson, 2014, p. 87).

This is similar to SE education in that students learn how to "uncover or create new opportunities through a[n] [entrepreneurial] process of exploration, innovation, experimentation, and resource mobilization" (Dees, 2007, p. 26). At the same time, whereas SE education tends to strive for profitable solutions to social problems (Dees & Anderson, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2012), CAP recognizes the limitations of market-oriented values and solutions and how they contribute to social injustices. CAP works towards solutions that are not based in neoliberal ethics of profit, and requires long-term collaboration *with* the community to determine and implement actions (Frey & Palmer, 2014, 2017). The approach of working *with* the community and not *for*, while also recognizing neoliberal values within SE, is also advocated by some SE scholars (i.e., Dees, 2012; Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Verduijn et al., 2014; Zietsma & Tuck, 2012), and thus, is an opportunity for connection between these two approaches to social change.

A creative opening emerges also from the different role of politics in SE and community-based education. SE education is largely conceived as apolitical and avoids associating the entrepreneur with activism (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Jarrodi, Byrne, & Bureau, 2019; Verduijn et al., 2014). On the other hand, CAP is "openly political, seeing an ethical imperative to teach students...how to be political and political change agents, and rejecting the possibility of an apolitical education" (Frey & Palmer, 2017, p. 363). Some SE scholars (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2010; 2012; Jarrodi, Byrne, & Bureau, 2019; Verduijn et al., 2014) recognize the political nature of SE education, and have called for the field of SE to "grapple with fundamentally political questions about the normative content of their objectives and their relationship to broader social and deliberative processes" (Cho, 2006, p. 39). Considering this tension, what are the opportunities for redefining politics and political engagement by bringing SE and community-based education together?

Intertwining SE and CAP would suggest a critical social entrepreneurship education (CSEE) framework that is experientially focused and uses a problem-assessment approach, while at the same time recognizing that such assessments are never value-free, that they need to include community voices and actions, and that learning happens in a myriad of interconnected informal and formal educational contexts. The explicitly critical orientation highlights pedagogical processes and goals that center reflexivity, listening, dialogue, and the

historical, experience- based analysis of social realities, recognizing SE -- and, indeed, all social actions -- as political.

Relationships

In the pedagogical praxis -- a reflexive process of learning and knowledge creation -- a set of relationships necessarily develops. An articulation of such relationships that is based on critical pedagogy can be found in an inquiry practice known as Community Based Participatory Action Research (CBPAR; Reason & Bradbury, 2001). CBPAR embraces a dialogic democratic process toward developing applied knowledge by bringing together *action* and *reflection* in the collaborative pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people and their communities (Reason, & Bradbury, 2001). CBPAR is an inquiry practice that is done *by* or *with* community members instead of *onto* them. As such, it recognizes and values contextual and everyday “on-the-ground” expertise instead of relying on “outside content experts” to solve local problems (Stoecker, 2009).

In contrast, traditional SE education programs tend to silence community and, at times, students' voices, and elevate the social entrepreneur (i.e., teacher and/or student) as the “expert” (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2010, 2012; Enos, 2015; Jensen, 2014; Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010; Verduijn et al., 2014). This reinforces a power-over relationship, valuing the development and maintenance of relationships through a control process (Cho, 2006; Congdon Jr., 2018; Verduijn et al., 2014). For instance, in an interview with the first author, a SE program leader and instructor remembered a situation when a student challenged the SE process. The co-participant stated: “I remember...having a huge debate with an 18-year-old. I'm like they don't know enough, it's not worth it. I think you sometimes get that” (Congdon Jr., 2018, p. 220). With his reflection, this co-participant positioned himself as the SE expert and, in this process, first silenced and denied the student's local knowledge and then moved on because “it's not worth it” to “debate with an 18-year-old.” This response contradicted critical communication pedagogies of care (Cummins, 2014), while also denying an opportunity for holistic development, as advocated by Jensen (2014). Specifically, the co-participant failed to see the issues in SE's structural arrangements and placed blame on the individual student for not understanding the material or embracing the SE process. The co-participant's silencing of students' voices may also have unintended consequences, since the student who may challenge the educator may be asking the tough and delicate questions lacking in many SE education programs (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Verduijn et al., 2014; Zietsma & Tuck, 2012). This tension of silencing voices and privileging the social entrepreneur's highlights how “more dialogical perspectives on social entrepreneurship” (Jarrodi, Byrne, & Bureau, 2019, p. 598) are needed, as SE education cannot be a one-size fits all solution if it is to live up to its emancipatory potential (Jarrodi, Byrne, & Bureau, 2019; Verduijn et al., 2014).

Community-based research and education emphasize the coproduction of knowledge and change among community members and various stakeholders, including academics (Belone et al., 2016; Dutta, 2017; Lindenfeld, Hall, McGreavy, Silka, & Hart, 2012; Stringer, 2014). The notion of expertise does not disappear, but it is more dispersed and inclusive, validating multiple ways of knowing and seeing diverse knowledge as necessary to meaningful social transformation. Expertise is grounded in a relational ethic of solidarity, defined as “the recognition of subaltern agency and the simultaneous recognition of the scholar's own participation in processes of social change” (Dutta & Kaur, 2017, p. 349). In one application, for example, Mohan Dutta and colleagues have been developing and implementing the Culture-Centered Approach to health communication (Dutta, 2017; Dutta et. al, 2019; Dutta & Kaur, 2017). In this approach, academics partner with communities to identify and address the structural, agentic, and cultural dimensions of health disparities (Dutta & Kaur, 2017). Academics are seen to bring certain, *partial*, expertise to such efforts, such as knowledge about how to reach audiences or produce communication texts. In addition, academics bring power

and access to communication channels that may not be available to the community (Dutta & Kaur, 2017). This, however, does not put the scholars-practitioners in the driver's seat of "innovation" -- it simply is part of the expertise and positionalities needed for the transformation to occur.

Like SE, community-based models are practically oriented in that they seek to address social challenges towards enhancing community well-being and resilience. Importantly, community-based interventions are theorized -- and recently, researched -- to have greater community impacts, since questions and actions are determined collaboratively (Dutta et al., 2019; Enck, 2014; Jovanovic, Congdon Jr., Miller, & Richardson, 2015; Lindenfeld, Hall, McGreavy, Silka, & Hart, 2012; Stringer, 2014; Willink & Suzette, 2012). Collaboration also impacts innovation (Ney, et al., 2014; Thorp & Goldstein, 2010; Woodman, 2012; Wyke, 2013) and, coupled with a critical orientation, holds the potential for imagining and bringing about a more equitable, socially just world (Britt, 2014; Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2010; Stoecker, 2009; Stringer, 2014). Jones, Warner, and Kiser (2010) argued the importance of collaboration to both SE and critical service-learning programs in higher education, asserting "the powerful benefits of a collaborative relationship between community partners, students, faculty, staff and administrators can pull many more innovative thinkers into the process to share crucial information about the community itself and what the true needs are" (p. 11). By working *with* others collaboratively -- recognizing each other's strengths, Verduijn et al. (2014) explain that a critical approach to SE has the potential to (re)connect "the destructive/oppressive with the emancipating/empowering potential of [social] entrepreneurship" (p. 106).

Impact

Impact in SE education programs tends to center around practical measures, focusing on concrete quantifiable data and/or deliverables (Cho, 2006; Congdon Jr., 2018; Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Enos, 2015; Jensen, 2014; Verduijn, et al., 2014; Wyke, 2013). For instance, the documents of the program that Congdon Jr. (2018) studied highlighted that the SE process "can be used on major innovation projects that have a dramatic impact on sales and profits or minor projects that help transform culture" (p. 97). In describing, analyzing, and reflecting on experiences within the SE education program examined, Congdon Jr. (2018) found that co-participants embodied an entrepreneurial approach, striving to develop and implement some sort of market-oriented project, entailing personal, product, service-orientated, and/or social change. The SE program itself presented as a Messiah-like figure, perfectly positioned to guide solutions to educational and economic problems by being objective and having universal applicability (Dey & Steyaert, 2010; 2012). This is problematic since context and positionality -- in culture, social movements, programs, and any other circumstances where human experience and difference is centered -- are disregarded (Britt, 2014; Cho, 2006; Jovanovic, Congdon Jr., Miller, & Richardson, 2015; Dees, 2012; Dey & Steyaert, 2010, 2012).

Jensen (2014) acknowledged the challenges of a SE education, when it comes to evaluating its impact in various contexts. Through conducting a case study using primary data gathered from quantitative course evaluations, interviews and observations of a SE graduate class in the humanities department at a university in Denmark, Jensen (2014) found that SE education programs focused too much on assessing independent courses, programs, or modules, and did not take a broader perspective to evaluating the potential impact of a SE education as a whole. Specifically, Jensen (2014) argued that when applied to the humanities, a SE education model should take the "holistic person perspective" (p. 250). The holistic person perspective is derived from situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991), which assumes that students learn through engaging in social practices, where both thoughts and actions take place in culturally and socially structured domains (Bassey, 2016; Gay, 2010; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Here, learning involves the whole person in connection and interaction with others in and with communities, which is extended in space and time. Situated learning connects to CCP

and community-based education by emphasizing community (learning as belonging), practice (learning as doing), identity (learning as becoming), and meaning (learning as experience) (Britt, 2014; Coker, 2016; Fassett & Warren, 2007; Frey & Palmer, 2014, 2017; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Thus, learners are constituted as “persons-in-the-world” (Jensen, 2014, p. 357).

In his study, Congdon Jr. (2018) found that critiques of the examined SE education program were dismissed as having a “lack of trust” (p. 98) rather than considered in relation to the SE system’s promotion of neoliberal values of impact. On one hand such discounting of critiques reinforces an articulation of knowledge with capital (as profitable solutions indicate mastery of SE), which is exclusionary and supports oppressive structures and ideologies (Cho, 2006; Fassett & Warren, 2007; Frey & Palmer, 2014, 2017; Szkudlarek, 2013; Tufte, 2017; Verduijn et al., 2014). On the other hand, the silencing of dissent limits opportunities to engage in meaningful dialogue and transformative change within the program and with/in its external applications (Dey & Steyaert, 2010, 2012). Precluding dialogue is especially troubling vis-a-vis SE’s proclaimed goal of igniting positive social change across various academic disciplines, communities, and other contexts (Cho, 2006; Freire & Macedo, 1995; Frey & Palmer, 2014, 2017; Papa, Singhal, & Papa, 2006; Tufte, 2017; Verduijn et al., 2014). Taken together, these consequences of ignoring meaningful engagement with critiques of SE threaten the possibility of (re)imagining the world and social relations in just and equitable ways (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2010, 2012; Verduijn et al., 2014).

As an educational alternative, critical approaches to interventions for positive social change acknowledge context and difference by naming and analyzing unjust power relations (Britt, 2014; Cho, 2006; Fassett & Warren, 2007; Frey & Palmer, 2014, 2017; Verduijn et al., 2014). From critical community-based education perspective, social change is ongoing and has personal, communal, relational, and structural dimensions, when it comes to evaluating impact (Britt, 2014; Fassett & Warren, 2007). Considering SE’s existing focus on the individual (Dey & Steyaert, 2010, 2012; Verduijn et al., 2014), a relevant aspect of impact is that of personal growth, which was an early goal of community-based education, particularly service-learning, and links to the pedagogical focus on reflexivity (Britt, 2014; Enos, 2015). A critical community-based perspective, however, would acknowledge that focusing on any one dimension of impact in isolation from the others would be insufficient and would maintain oppressive structures and social relationships. Instead, CSEE envisions a systems-based evaluation of effects and consequences, as advocated by Cho (2006), Dey and Steyaert (2010, 2012, 2016), and Verduijn, Dey, Tedmanson, and Essers (2014).

Just as there are critiques of SE, critiques of CP/CCP with regards to implications and effects are also warranted. Specifically, Khal Jr. (2017) and Frey and Palmer (2014, 2017) explain that CP/CCP approaches lack any clear articulation of the impacts these pedagogies have on student learning and in the community. There is a need to better understand how to assess impact and learning in critical pedagogues and community-based education. This provides an opportunity for CP/CCP to learn from SE education approaches and look into practically assessing impact by examining changes in both material and cultural realities (Jensen, 2014; Ney et al., 2014; Verduijn et al., 2014). As Tufte (2017) suggested, community-engaged scholars need to adopt, “a new grammar of change,” which should include, “new logics of action, new actors, new narratives, and new strategies to articulate them and make them heard” (p. 140). CSEE holds a promise to inform/transform a traditional SE education approaches by better recognizing, understanding, and examining various power dynamics that may be involved in the local, historical, cultural, social, political, and environmental contexts when addressing social issues (Cho, 2006; Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Verduijn et al., 2014). Specifically, CSEE embraces Dey and Steyaert’s (2012) call for SE education to move towards an “interventionist” approach to impact, which prioritizes dialogue, listening, reflexivity, and “participatory modes of interaction to co-produce new knowledge while simultaneously

enacting new realities” (p. 102). Furthermore, the CSEE framework emphasizes that impact(s) should be assessed and critically examined from a systems perspective and across these different contexts (Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Jensen, 2014; Verduijn et al., 2014).

Conclusion

As SE education continues to spread in different contexts and as scholar-educators seek ways to integrate it with community engaged work (Enos, 2015; Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010; Winfield, 2005), attention should be paid to the pedagogy, relationships, and impact of SE programs. A CSEE framework envisions collaborative capacity building that aims at analyzing and addressing challenges in our shared and complex social realities. Pedagogical practices are based on ongoing dialogue, reflexivity, relationship-building, and the sharing of multifaceted expertise. Relationships honor solidarity and multi-level ethical accountability. Impact should be measurable and meaningful within the particular contexts and should encompass the material reality (i.e., structural dimensions), as well as personal, relational, and communal aspects. We believe that the CSEE model can help address the currently insufficient incorporation of critical reflexivity and relational accountability in SE education. However, questions remain and offer directions for future research: What do CSEE partnerships look like short- and long-term, and how do such partnerships develop and grow? What, if any, other commitments should be considered beyond the three discussed in this essay? In what ways should “impact” be conceptualized and assessed, practically? Attending to these concerns will help ensure that SE education programs and community-engaged work remain meaningful for years to come, advancing a more just and equitable world in a variety of (cultural) contexts.

References

- Abbott, A., & Lear, D. (2010). The connections goal area in Spanish community service learning: Possibilities and limitations. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(2), 231-245. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2010.01076.x
- Ahmed, S. M., Maurana, C., Nelson, D., Meister, T., Young, S. N., & Lucey, P. (2016). Opening the black box: Conceptualizing community engagement from 109 community-academic partnership programs. *Progress in community health partnerships: research, education, and action*, 10(1), 51-61.
- Amundam, D. N. (2019). Enhancing potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurship education: A curriculum content and teaching method model. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 22(5).
- Bartolomé, L. I. (2004). Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 97-122.
- Bassey, M. (2016). Culturally responsive teaching: Implications for educational justice. *Education Sciences*, 6(4), 35. doi:10.3390/educsci6040035
- Belone, L., Lucero, J. E., Duran, B., Tafoya, G., Baker, E. A., Chan, D., ... & Wallerstein, N. (2016). Community-based participatory research conceptual model: Community partner consultation and face validity. *Qualitative health research*, 26(1), 117-135.
- Breunig, M. (2005). Turning experiential education and critical pedagogy theory into praxis. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 28(2), 106-122.
- Breunig, M. (2009). Teaching for and about critical pedagogy in the post-secondary classroom. *Studies in Social Justice*, 3(2), 247-262.
- Breunig, M. (2011). Problematizing critical pedagogy. *The International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3(3), 2-23.

- Britt, L.L. (2014). Service-learning in the service of social justice: Situating communication activism pedagogy within a typology of service-learning approaches. In L. Frey & D. Palmer (Eds.). *Teaching communication activism: Communication education for social justice* (pp. 139-166). New York, NY: Hampton Press
- Brock, D.D. & Steiner, S.D. (2009). *Social entrepreneurship education. Is it achieving its desired aims*. Paper presented at the United States Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship (USASBE) Conference, San Antonio, TX, 2009. New York: Social Science Research Network. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1344419>.
- Brock, D., Steiner, S. & Jordan, L. (2012). Using the social entrepreneurship model to teach engineering students how to create lasting change. In T. Colledge (Ed.), *Convergence* (pp. 80-90). Pennsylvania State University: International Journal for Service Learning in Engineering, Humanitarian Engineering and Social Entrepreneurship.
- Cajaiba-Santana, G. (2014). Social innovation: Moving the field forward. A conceptual framework. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 82, 42-51. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2013.05.008
- Cho, A. H. (2006). Politics, values and social entrepreneurship: A critical appraisal. In J. Mair, J. Robinson, & K. Hockerts (Eds). *Social Entrepreneurship* (pp. 34-56). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coker, W. (2016). *Engaging practice in communication education: Institutional politics, knowledge economy, and state power* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Michigan Technological University, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (Accession No. 10120284)
- Congdon Jr., M. J. (2018). *Looking at innovation dialogically: Teaching communication and(social) change in the Innovation Engineering program at the University of Maine* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Electronic Theses and Dissertations database. 2830. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/etd/2830>
- Cummins, M.W. (2014). *Communicating care: A critical communication pedagogy of care in the University classroom* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3642731)
- Danowitz, M., & Tuitt, F. (2011). Enacting inclusivity through engaged pedagogy: A higher education perspective. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 44(1), 40-56.
- Davis, J., Madden, E., Cronley, C., & Beamon, K. (2019). Voices from the field: A qualitative exploration of community partners' definitions of service-learning. *Partnerships: Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, 10(1), 146-155.
- Dees, J. G. (2007). Taking social entrepreneurship seriously. *Society*, 44(3), 24-31. doi:10.1007/BF02819936
- Dees, J.G. (2012). A tale of two cultures: Charity, problem solving, and the future of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 321-334. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1412-5
- Dees, J. G., & Anderson, B.B. (2006). Framing a theory of social entrepreneurship: Building on two schools of practice and thought. In R. Mosher-Williams (Ed.). *Research on Social Entrepreneurship: Understanding and contributing to an emerging field* (pp. 39-66). Indianapolis, IN: ARNOVA
- Dey, P., & Steyaert, C. (2010). The politics of narrating social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 4(1), 85-108. doi:10.1108/17506201011029528
- Dey, P., & Steyaert, C. (2012). Social entrepreneurship: Critique and the radical enactment of the social. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 8(2), 90-107. doi:10.1108/17508611211252828

- Dey, P., & Steyaert, C. (2016). Rethinking the space of ethics in social entrepreneurship: Power, subjectivity, and practices of freedom. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133(4), 627-641. doi:10.1007/s10551-014-2450-y
- DiAngelo, R., & Sensoy, O. (2014). Leaning in: A student's guide to engaging constructively with social justice content. *Radical Pedagogy*, 11(1), 1-15.
- Dutta, M. J. (2017). Culturally centering social change communication: Subaltern critiques of, resistance to, and re-imagination of development. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 13(2), 87-104. doi:10.1080/17447143.2018.1446440
- Dutta, M. J., Collins, W., Sastry, S., Dillard, S., Anaele, A., Kumar, R., . . . Bonu, T. (2019). A culture-centered community-grounded approach to disseminating health information among African Americans. *Health Communication*, 34(10), 1075-1084. doi:10.1080/10410236.2018.1455626
- Dutta, M. J. & Kaur, (2017). Communicating the culture-centered approach to health disparities. In J. Yamasaki, P. Geist-Martin, & B.F. Sharf (Eds.). *Storied health and illness: Communicating personal, cultural, and political complexities* (pp. 333-356). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297-324.
- Enck, S. (2014). Feminist communication activism pedagogy – "Gender and violence: Dominance, resistance, and the cultural production of meaning." In. L. Frey & D. Palmer (Eds.). *Teaching communication activism: Communication education for social justice* (pp. 199-230). New York, NY: Hampton Press.
- Enos, S. (2015). *Service-learning and social entrepreneurship in higher education: A pedagogy of social change*. New York, NY: Palgrave Pivot.
- Evans, R.W. (2010). The (unfulfilled) promise of critical pedagogy. In S. Totten & J.E. Pedersen (Eds.), *Teaching and studying social issues: Major programs and approaches* (pp. 233-249). Charlotte: Information Age Publishing
- Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed, 30th anniv.* Ed. New York: Continuum. (Original work published in 1970).
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1995). A dialogue: Culture, language, and race. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 377-403
- Frey, L., & Palmer, D. (2014). *Teaching communication activism: Communication education for social justice*. New York, NY: Hampton Press.
- Frey, L., & Palmer, D. (2017). Communication activism pedagogy and research: Communication education scholarship to promote social justice. *Communication Education*, 66(3), 462-467. doi:10.1080/03634523.2017.1290812.
- Furco, A. (1996). Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. In B. Taylor (Ed.), *Expanding boundaries: Serving and learning* (pp. 2-7), Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.
- Furco, A., & Norvell, K. (2019). What is service learning?: Making sense of the pedagogy and practice. In P. Aramburuzabala, L. McIlrath, & H. Opazo (Eds.). *Embedding Service Learning in European Higher Education* (pp. 13-35). New York: Routledge.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press
- Gilmartin, M.J. (2013). Principles and practices of social entrepreneurship for nursing. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 52(11), 641. doi:10.3928/01484834-20131014-03
- Giroux, H. (2012). *Education and the crisis of public values: Challenging the assault on teachers, students, & public education*. New York, NY: Peter Lane.

- Gore, J.M. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Gur-Ze'ev, I. (1998). Toward a nonrepressive critical pedagogy. *Educational Theory*, 48(4), 463-486. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.1998.00463.x
- Guthman, J. (2008). Bringing good food to others: Investigating the subjects of alternative food practice. *Cultural geographies*, 15(4), 431-447.
- Gutierrez-Perez, R. (2016). "A letter from my students": Transformative pedagogy, borderlands performance, and the critical junctures of whiteness. *Liminalities*, 12(4), 1-19.
- Hall, D. (2013). Innovation Engineering: History, learning and plans for the future. *Report to the National Academy of Sciences*.
- Hammersley, L. (2012). Community-Based Service-Learning: Partnerships of Reciprocal Exchange?. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 14(3), 171-184.
- Herzig, M., Kelman, K., Krikun, A., Matthews, S. R., & Browning, Y. (2018). Key learnings from an international social entrepreneurship collaboration: Songs to change our world. *MEIEA Journal*, 18(1), 3-71.
- Holland, J. H., George, P. L., & Nelson, K. M. (2019). Building a service corps: Using capacity building strategies to promote service-learning and social entrepreneurship within a higher education consortium. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning & Civic Engagement*, 10(2), 192-228.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge.
- Ivankova, N. V. (2017). Applying mixed methods in community-based participatory action research: A framework for engaging stakeholders with research as a means for promoting patient-centeredness. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 22(4), 282-294. doi: 10.1177/1744987117699655
- Jarrodi, H., Byrne, J., & Bureau, S. (2019). A political ideology lens on social entrepreneurship motivations. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 31(7-8), 583-604. doi:10.1080/08985626.2019.1596353
- Janes, J. E. (2016). Democratic encounters? Epistemic privilege, power, and community based participatory action research. *Action Research*, 14(1), 72-87. doi:10.1177/1476750315579129
- Janus, K. K. (2015). Bringing social entrepreneurship into the classroom. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, from http://ssir.org/articles/entry/bringing_social_entrepreneurship_into_the_classroom
- Jensen, T. L. (2014). A holistic person perspective in measuring entrepreneurship education impact – social entrepreneurship education at the humanities. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 12(3), 349-364. doi:10.1016/j.ijme.2014.07.002
- Jones, A. L., Warner, B., & Kiser, P. (2010). Service-learning and social entrepreneurship: From strangers to allies. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, 1(2), 1-15. doi:10.7253/partj.v0i0.423
- Jovanovic, S., Congdon Jr. Jr, M., Miller, C., & Richardson, G. (2015). Rooting the study of communication activism in an attempted book ban. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, 6(1), 115-135.
- Kahl Jr., D. H. (2017). Addressing the challenges of critical communication pedagogy scholarship: Moving toward an applied agenda. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 45(1), 116-120. doi:10.1080/00909882.2016.1248468
- Kajner, T., Chovanec, D., Underwood, M., & Mian, A. (2013). Critical community service learning: Combining critical classroom pedagogy with activist community placements. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 19(2), 36-48.

- Kelly, R.W. (2014). *Invention and opportunity: A historical perspective and emerging model for innovation in Maine* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from DigitalCommons@UMaine Electronic Theses and Dissertations. (2395).
- Kickul, J., Janssen-Selvadurai, C., & Griffiths, M. D. (2012). A blended value framework for educating the next cadre of social entrepreneurs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 479-493
- Kickul, J., & Lyons, T. (2012). *Understanding social entrepreneurship: The relentless pursuit of mission in an ever changing world*. New York: Routledge.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York; Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press
- Levine, P. (2013). The civic mission of higher education at a time of democratic discontent. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, 4(2), 95-102.
- Lindenfeld, L.A., Hall, D.M., McGreavy, B., Silka, L., & Hart, D. (2012). Creating a place for environmental communication research in sustainability science. *Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture*, 6(1), 23-43.
- Lipman, P. (2017). Beyond accountability: Toward schools that create new people for a new way of life. In A. Darder, R.D. Torres, & M.P. Baltodano (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 578-597). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Litzky, B.E., Godshalk, V.M., & Walton-Bongers, C. (2010). Social entrepreneurship and community leadership: A service-learning model for management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 34(1), 142-162. doi: 10.1177/1052562909338038
- Mahoney, K. (2011). You can't get there from here: Higher education, labor activism, and challenges of neoliberal globalization. In S. Kahn & J. Lee (Eds.). *Activism and rhetoric: Theories and contexts for political engagement* (pp. 147-158). London: Routledge.
- Martin, J.N., & Nakayama, T.K. (1999). Thinking dialectically about culture and communication. *Communication Theory*, 9(1), 1-25. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00160.x
- Martinez, Z.L., Padmanabhan, P., & Toyne, B. (2007). Integrating international business and liberal arts education. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 18(4), 37-55. doi:10.1300/J066v18n04_03
- McInerney, P., Smyth, J., & Down, B. (2011). 'Coming to a place near you?' The politics and possibilities of a critical pedagogy of place-based education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 3-16.
- Mitchell, T. D. (2008). Traditional vs. critical service-learning: Engaging the literature to differentiate two models. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(2), 50-65.
- Mumby, D.K. (2005). Theorizing resistance in organization studies: A dialectical approach. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(1), 19-44. doi:10.1177/0893318905276558
- Ney, S., Beckmann, M., Graebnitz, D., & Mirkovic, R. (2014). Social entrepreneurs and social change: tracing impacts of social entrepreneurship through ideas, structures and practices. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 6(1), 51-68.
- Nga, J. K. H., & Shamuganathan, G. (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(2), 259-282.
- Nylund, D. & Tilsen, J. (2006). Pedagogy and praxis: Postmodern spirit in the classroom. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, 25(4), 21-31. doi:10.1521/jsyt.2006.25.4.21
- Oloke, I., Lindsay, P., & Byrne, S. (2018). The intersection of critical emancipatory peacebuilding and social enterprise: A dialogical approach to social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 81, 67-86.

- Osburg, T., & Schmidpeter, R. (2013). *Social innovation: Solutions for a sustainable future*. New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-36540-9
- Oyler, C. (2012). *Actions speak louder than words: Community activism as curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Pache, A. C., & Chowdhury, I. (2012). Social entrepreneurs as institutionally embedded entrepreneurs: Toward a new model of social entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 494-510
- Papa, M.J., Singhal, A., & Papa, W.H. (2006). *Organizing for social change. A dialectic journey of theory and praxis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Reason, P. & Bradbury, H. (Eds.) (2001). *Handbook of action research: Participative Inquiry and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Roper, J., & Cheney, G. (2005). Leadership, learning and human resource management: The meanings of social entrepreneurship today. *Corporate Governance*, 5(3), 95.
- Ruiz, B.M., & Fernandez-Balboa, J.M. (2005). Physical education teacher educators' personal perspectives regarding their practice of critical pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 24(3), 243-264
- Saebi, T., Foss, N. J., & Linder, S. (2019). Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future promises. *Journal of Management*, 45(1), 70-95. doi:10.1177/0149206318793196
- Shor, I. (1996). *When students have power: Negotiating authority in a critical pedagogy*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press
- Short, J. C., Moss, T. W., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3(2), 161-194. doi:10.1002/sej.69
- Simpson, J. (2014). Communication activism pedagogy: Theoretical frameworks, central concepts, and challenges. In L. Frey & D. Palmer (Eds.). *Teaching communication activism: Communication education for social justice* (pp. 77-103). New York, NY: Hampton Press
- Stenhouse, V. L., & Jarrett, O. S. (2012). In the service of learning and activism: Service learning, critical pedagogy, and the problem solution project. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 39(1), 51-76.
- Stoecker, R. (2009). Are we talking the walk of community-based research? *Action Research*, 7(4), 385-404. doi:10.1177/1476750309340944
- Stringer, E.T. (2014). *Action research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Suoranta, J. & Moisio, O.P. (2006). Critical pedagogy as collective social expertise in higher education. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 2(3), 47-64.
- Szkudlarek, T. (2013). *Education and the political: New theoretical articulations*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. doi:10.1007/978-94-6209-383-6
- Thorp, H., & Goldstein, B. (2010). *Engines of innovation: The entrepreneurial university in the twenty-first century*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Tufte, T. (2017). *Communication and social change: A citizen perspective*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press
- Verduijn, K., Dey, P., Tedmanson, D., & Essers, C. (2014). Emancipation and/or oppression? Conceptualizing dimensions of criticality in entrepreneurship studies. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 20(2), 98-107. doi:10.1108/IJEBr-02-2014-0031
- Vidra, R. L., Gallagher, D. R., & Wilson, V. (2019). Acknowledging the challenges of pedagogical innovation: The case of integrating research, teaching, and the practice of environmental leadership. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, 9(3), 270-275. doi:10.1007/s13412-019-00551-2

- Willink, K.G., & Suzette, J. (2012). Taking theories of cultural dialogue from the classroom to the street corner. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 12(3), 197-212. doi:10.1177/1532708612440252
- Winfield, I. (2005). Fostering social entrepreneurship through liberal learning in the social sciences. *Peer Review*, 7(3), 15.
- Woodman, B.J. (2012). *Sustainability mindset: Practical implications of an existential analysis of freedom, flourishing, and ecological interdependence* (Doctoral dissertation). Emory University: Atlanta, GA.
- Wyke, R.M.C. (2013). *Teaching creativity and innovation in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, PA. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3592900).
- Zietsma, C., & Tuck, R. (2012). First, do no harm: Evaluating resources for teaching social entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 512-517.